



Sainz, A. B., Hoban, M. J., Skrzypczyk, P., & Aolita, L. (2020). Bipartite Postquantum Steering in Generalized Scenarios. *Physical Review Letters*, 125, [050404].  
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document


This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via American Physical Society at <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

## Bipartite Postquantum Steering in Generalized Scenarios

Ana Belén Sainz<sup>1,2</sup>, Matty J. Hoban,<sup>3</sup> Paul Skrzypczyk,<sup>4</sup> and Leandro Aolita<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

<sup>2</sup>*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline Street North, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 2Y5*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Computing, Goldsmiths, University of London, London SE14 6NW, United Kingdom*

<sup>4</sup>*H. H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Tyndall Avenue, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom*

<sup>5</sup>*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Caixa Postal 68528, 21941-972 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil*



(Received 24 July 2019; revised 18 February 2020; accepted 29 June 2020; published 29 July 2020)

The study of stronger-than-quantum effects is a fruitful line of research that provides valuable insight into quantum theory. Unfortunately, traditional bipartite steering scenarios can always be explained by quantum theory. Here, we show that, by relaxing this traditional setup, bipartite steering incompatible with quantum theory is possible. The two scenarios we describe, which still feature Alice remotely steering Bob's system, are (i) one where Bob also has an input and operates on his subsystem, and (ii) the “instrumental steering” scenario. We show that such bipartite postquantum steering is a genuinely new type of postquantum nonlocality, which does not follow from postquantum Bell nonlocality. In addition, we present a method to bound quantum violations of steering inequalities in these scenarios.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404)

**Introduction.**—Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering is a striking nonlocal feature of quantum theory [1,2]. First discussed by Schrödinger [1], it refers to the phenomenon where Alice, by performing measurements on half of a shared system, remotely “steers” the state of a distant Bob, in a way which has no classical explanation. From a modern quantum information perspective [2] steering certifies entanglement in situations where Alice's devices are uncharacterized or untrusted, allowing for “one-sided device independent” implementations of information-theoretic tasks, such as quantum key distribution [3], randomness certification [4,5], measurement incompatibility certification [6–8], and self-testing [9,10].

Given the usefulness of quantum steering as a resource for information processing, a comprehensive understanding of this nonclassical phenomenon as a resource is highly desirable. A fruitful way to approach this, pursued in the study of other nonclassical phenomena, e.g., Bell nonlocality [11] and contextuality [12], is to investigate it “from the outside”: namely, to study it operationally from the perspective of a more general theory—which may supersede quantum theory—and then understand which aspects are purely quantum. Studying phenomena beyond what quantum theory predicts is relevant not only from the hypothetical perspective of a postquantum theory, but also—and above all—because it allows for a deeper understanding of the foundations of quantum theory and the limitations it has for information processing [13]. The main question studied here is how to properly understand steering from this more general perspective, on which we report substantial progress in this Letter.

Abstractly, we may view the steering scenario as one where Alice has a device that accepts a classical input  $x$ ,

usually thought of as labeling the choice of measurement, and produces a classical outcome  $a$ , usually thought of as the measurement result, while Bob has a device without an input, that produces a quantum system, which is correlated with the input and outcome of Alice, and usually thought of as the steered system. Here, we are interested in the possibility that the local structure of quantum theory is maintained, while considering more general global structure—for instance, more general types of correlations or global dynamics.

In this setting, we would like to reexamine the phenomenon of steering. A natural question that arises is whether a more general theory may allow for steering beyond what quantum theory predicts. That is, could it be possible to find a pair of devices for Alice and Bob which could not be produced within quantum theory, by Alice and Bob sharing a quantum state, upon which Alice performs measurements labeled by  $x$  and with outcomes  $a$ ? The only requirement that we maintain in this generalized setting is that of relativistic causality: Alice should not be able to use steering to signal to Bob, i.e., to send information to him instantaneously.

A celebrated theorem by Gisin [14] and Hughston, Josza, and Wootters [15] (GHJW) shows that postquantum steering cannot occur in the traditional setting. Namely, any pair of devices that do not allow signaling from Alice to Bob can always be realized by some carefully chosen set of measurements and quantum state. The traditional setting is, however, not the only interesting scenario where one can see the steering phenomena. In Ref. [16], postquantum *multipartite* steering was discovered: in a tripartite scenario, Alice and Bob are able to jointly steer the state of a




FIG. 1. Different generalized bipartite steering setups. (a) The traditional scenario: Alice makes a measurement, steering the state of Bob. (b) The sequential-measurement scenario: Alice now performs a sequence of measurements, steering the state of Bob multiple times. (c) The Bob-with-input (BWI) scenario: Bob now also has an input, allowing him to also influence his state, by performing some operation on it. (d) The instrumental steering scenario: is similar to BWI except that Bob's input now depends on Alice's outcome. The top two scenarios [(a) and (b)] do not admit postquantum steering. We show here that the bottom two scenarios [(c) and (d)] have postquantum steering.

third party, Charlie, in a way which cannot arise from measurements on any quantum state. Subsequently, unified frameworks for studying quantum and postquantum steering in the multipartite setting have been developed, providing a playground for exploring this fascinating effect [17,18].

A key question that nevertheless remained unanswered is whether it is possible to have postquantum steering in a suitable generalized bipartite scenario, or whether postquantum steering is a purely multipartite phenomenon. In this Letter, we answer this question in the positive. We discover two natural bipartite generalizations of steering that allow for postquantum effects [see Fig. 1 cases (c) and (d), respectively]: one where Bob also has an input that allows him to additionally influence his quantum state, and another where this additional influence is instead conditioned on Alice's outcome. This second generalization corresponds to a specific type of setup known as the “instrumental causal network,” that is ubiquitous in causal inference [19,20]. Furthermore, we show, crucially, that in both cases the postquantum steering uncovered genuinely constitutes new effects, that are distinct from postquantum nonlocality in the associated generalized setups. We do this by finding explicit examples of postquantum steering where if Bob performs measurements on his quantum system, then the resulting outcome statistics are never postquantum nonlocal. To prove our results, we develop a numerical technique to bound the quantum violations of steering inequalities.

**Preliminaries.**—In the traditional bipartite quantum steering scenario [see Fig. 1(a)] Alice and Bob share a system in a possibly entangled quantum state  $\rho$ . Alice is

allowed to perform generalized measurements on her share of the system, which correspond to positive-operator valued measures (POVM). Alice chooses one such measurement  $\{M_{a|x}\}_a$ , labeled by  $x$ , from a set of measurements, and obtains an outcome  $a$  with probability  $p(a|x) = \text{tr}\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\rho\}$ . After the measurement, Bob's steered state is  $\rho_{a|x} = \text{tr}_A\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\rho\}/p(a|x)$ . It is convenient to work with the unnormalized steered states  $\sigma_{a|x} = p(a|x)\rho_{a|x} = \text{tr}_A\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\rho\}$ , which contain both the information about both Alice's conditional probabilities  $p(a|x) = \text{tr}\{\sigma_{a|x}\}$ , and Bob's conditional states  $\rho_{a|x}$ . The collection  $\{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$  of unnormalized states Bob is steered into is called an *assemblage*. Because of the completeness relation for Alice's measurements,  $\sum_a M_{a|x} = \mathbb{I}$  for all  $x$ , it follows that  $\sum_a \sigma_{a|x} = \text{tr}_A\{\rho\} = \rho_B$ , independent of  $x$ . This can be seen as a no-signaling condition from Alice to Bob, since Bob, without knowledge of the outcome of Alice, has no information about the choice of measurement she made.

One natural generalization of the traditional steering scenario is to allow Alice to make a sequence of measurements on her share of the system, such that each measurement has the potential to steer the state of Bob. This situation is depicted in Fig. 1(b). In the Supplemental Material [21], we show that this generalization in fact does not feature postquantum steering either; this can be seen as an extension of the GHJW theorem [14,15] to the sequential scenario.

**Bipartite steering when Bob has an input [Fig. 1(c)].**—We consider now the generalization where Bob's device also accepts an input before producing a quantum state. Intuitively, we can think that this input may determine the preparation of some quantum system, which could come about from a transformation on a quantum system inside Bob's device. This situation is depicted in Fig. 1(c), where  $y$  denotes the input. In this generalized scenario, the members of the assemblage will be  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}\}_{a,x,y}$ . Note that when the variable  $y$  takes only one possible value, this scenario reduces to the traditional bipartite steering setup of Fig. 1(a).

In the context of quantum theory, we assume that Alice and Bob share a quantum state  $\rho$  and that Alice performs measurements labeled by  $x$ , as in the standard scenario. Given that Bob now has an input, the most general operation that he could apply is a completely positive and trace-preserving (CPTP) channel onto his part of the quantum system. Thus, the quantum assemblages that can be generated are as follows.

**Definition 1. Quantum Bob-with-input assemblages.**—An assemblage  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}\}_{a,x,y}$  has a quantum realization in the Bob-with-input steering scenario iff there exists a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and POVMs  $\{M_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$  for Alice, a state  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ , and a collection of CPTP maps  $\{\mathcal{E}_y\}_y$  in  $\mathcal{H}_B$  for Bob, such that

$$\sigma_{a|xy} = \mathcal{E}_y[\text{tr}_A\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I})\rho\}]. \quad (1)$$

We denote this set of assemblages as  $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{BWI}}$ .

Note that this definition of quantum Bob-with-input (BWI) assemblages does not require that the operations take place in a particular order. That is, the same assemblage can be obtained if the map  $\mathcal{E}_y$  is applied to Bob's subsystem before Alice measures hers.

To go beyond quantum theory, we have to identify the most general constraints that apply here. Not only must we now ensure no signaling from Alice to Bob, but since Bob has an input, we must also ensure no signaling from Bob to Alice. These constraints are captured by the following definition:

**Definition 2: Nonsignaling Bob-with-input assemblages.**—An assemblage  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}\}_{a,x,y}$  is nonsignaling in the Bob-with-input steering scenario iff  $\sigma_{a|xy} \geq 0$  for all  $a, x, y$ , and

$$\sum_a \sigma_{a|xy} = \sum_a \sigma_{a|x'y} \quad \forall x, x', y, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{tr}\{\sigma_{a|xy}\} = p(a|x) \quad \forall a, x, y, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{tr} \sum_a \sigma_{a|xy} = 1 \quad \forall x, y, \quad (4)$$

where  $p(a|x)$  is the probability that Alice obtains outcome  $a$  when performing measurement  $x$  on her share of the system. We denote the set of such assemblages as  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BWI}}$ .

We can now return to our central question of whether there can exist postquantum steering in this scenario. Here, we find that this is indeed the case:

**Theorem 3.**—The set of all nonsignaling Bob-with-input assemblages is strictly larger than the set of quantum Bob-with-input assemblages,  $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{BWI}} \neq \mathcal{G}_{\text{BWI}}$ . Hence, there is postquantum steering in the Bob-with-input steering scenario.

*Proof.*—We construct an explicit example of an assemblage in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{BWI}}$  which cannot be realized in quantum theory.

Consider the specific scenario where Alice has binary inputs and outcomes,  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ , Bob has a binary input  $y \in \{0, 1\}$ , and the dimension of Bob's Hilbert space is 2. Consider the following assemblage:

$$\sigma_{a|xy}^* := \frac{1}{2}(|a\rangle\langle a|\delta_{xy=0} + |a \oplus 1\rangle\langle a \oplus 1|\delta_{xy=1}). \quad (5)$$

Note that (i)  $\sigma_{a|xy}^* \geq 0$  for all  $a, x, y$ ; (ii)  $\sum_a \sigma_{a|xy}^* = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{xy=0} + \delta_{xy=1})\mathbb{I} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}$ , which is independent of  $x$  and  $y$ ; (iii)  $\text{tr}\{\sigma_{a|xy}^*\} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{xy=0} + \delta_{xy=1}) = \frac{1}{2}$  is independent of  $y$  and (iv)  $\text{tr} \sum_a \sigma_{a|xy}^* = 1$ . This shows that  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}^*\}$  is a valid no-signaling assemblage, i.e.,  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}^*\} \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{BWI}}$ .

Now we show that this assemblage cannot arise in quantum theory, i.e.,  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}^*\} \notin \mathcal{Q}_{\text{BWI}}$ . We do so by first

noting that for a quantum-realizable assemblage, since  $(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{E}_y)[\rho]$  is a bipartite quantum state when  $\mathcal{E}_y$  is a CPTP channel, Alice and Bob can only produce quantum Bell correlations, should Bob choose to measure his system. Namely, let Bob make an arbitrary measurement  $\{N_b\}_b$ , on his state in a quantum assemblage  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}\}_{a,x,y}$ . Then, the correlations obtained are

$$\begin{aligned} p(a, b|x, y) &= \text{tr}\{N_b \sigma_{a|xy}\}, \\ &= \text{tr}_B\{N_b \mathcal{E}_y[\text{tr}_A\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I})\rho\}]\}, \\ &= \text{tr}\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathcal{E}_y^\dagger(N_b))\rho\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}_y(\cdot)$  is a CPTP channel, the dual map  $\mathcal{E}_y^\dagger(\cdot)$  is unital, and hence  $\mathcal{E}_y^\dagger(N_b)$  is always valid POVM. This provides an explicit quantum realization of the correlations  $p(a, b|x, y)$ . We will thus prove that (5) is not quantum realizable by demonstrating that it can generate correlations  $p(a, b|x, y)$  which are known to be impossible within quantum theory.

Let  $N_b = |b\rangle\langle b|$  be the computational basis measurement. The correlations that Alice and Bob obtain are

$$p(a, b|x, y) = \langle b|\sigma_{a|xy}^*|b\rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } a \oplus b = xy, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

These are the correlations of the ‘‘Popescu-Rohrlich’’ box [35], which are not achievable within quantum theory. Hence,  $\sigma_{a|xy}^* \notin \mathcal{Q}_{\text{BWI}}$  and so  $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{BWI}} \neq \mathcal{G}_{\text{BWI}}$ .

We see then that postquantum steering can arise in a generalized bipartite steering scenario. This example given, however, relies on postquantum nonlocality and hence the postquantum steering found may be argued to be just another guise of the former effect. In the following theorem, we prove that the two phenomena are genuinely different:

**Theorem 4.**—Postquantum steering in the Bob-with-input steering scenario is independent of postquantum nonlocality. Namely, there exist nonsignaling assemblages  $\{\sigma_{a|xy}\}$  that are not quantum realizable, but which can only lead to quantum correlations  $p(a, b|x, y)$  in the Bell scenario.

The proof of this theorem is given in the Supplemental Material [21]. The main idea is to show that the following assemblage has the desired properties, i.e., that it is postquantum and that whenever Bob performs a measurement  $\{N_b\}$  on it, the observed outcome statistics  $p(ab|xy) = \text{tr}\{N_b \sigma_{a|xy}\}$  have always a quantum realization:

$$\sigma_{a|xy} = \frac{1}{4}[\mathbb{I} + (-1)^{a+\delta_{x,2}\delta_{y,1}}\sigma_x], \quad (6)$$

where  $x \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) = (X, Y, Z)$  are the Pauli operators.

The method to show that this assemblage can only yield quantum correlations is to notice that one may mathematically represent this assemblage as Alice performing Pauli measurements on the maximally entangled state, and Bob



applying either the identity or transpose map (which crucially is positive but not completely positive) depending on  $y$  [36]. Then, following Ref. [18], the assemblage Eq. (6) can only yield quantum correlations. In the Supplemental Material [21] we further prove that the assemblage is postquantum: we construct an explicit steering inequality that is (robustly) violated by the assemblage (6) beyond the quantum bound. For this, we present a method to bound the quantum bound of a steering inequality in this scenario. We also present an alternative analytic proof of the claim.

Hence, just as for multipartite postquantum steering [16], the effect here is independent of the existence of post-quantum Bell nonlocality.

**Instrumental steering [Fig. 1(d)].**—We now consider the instrumental steering scenario [37]. In this case, Bob still has an input that can inform the preparation of a quantum system, however, now this input can depend on Alice’s measurement outcome [see Fig. 1(d)]. For example, Bob’s input could just decide a transformation upon a quantum system. To recover the traditional steering scenario, we again enforce the constraint that Bob only has one input, and thus we trivially have no dependence on Alice’s output. This scenario is closely related to the so-called “instrumental setup” [19,20], only now one of the variables has become a quantum system. Indeed, this close relation between instrumental steering and the instrumental setup will enable us to identify a connection between the instrumental steering scenario and the Bob-with-input scenario further below.

In the instrumental steering scenario, an assemblage is given by the collection of subnormalized states  $\{\sigma_{a|x}\}$ , where  $x$  denotes the choice of measurement by Alice, and  $a$  denotes both Alice’s outcome and Bob’s input. Within quantum theory, the assemblages they can generate are the following:

**Definition 5. Quantum Instrumental assemblages.**—An assemblage  $\{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$  has a quantum realization in the instrumental steering scenario iff there exists a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and POVMs  $\{M_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$  for Alice, a state  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ , and a collection of CPTP maps  $\{\mathcal{E}_a\}_a$  in  $\mathcal{H}_B$  for Bob, such that

$$\sigma_{a|x} = \mathcal{E}_a[\text{tr}_A\{(M_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I})\rho\}]. \quad (7)$$

We denote this set of assemblages by  $\mathcal{Q}_I$ .

The instrumental steering scenario has no straightforward nonsignaling constraints. Hence, in order to define general assemblages here, we adopt the relation between nonsignaling Bell correlations and generic instrumental correlations in the black-box scenario found in Ref. [38] (see also Supplemental Material of Ref. [39]). In the instrumental setup, where the so-called device-independent instrumental correlations are studied, it was recently found that these correlations are indeed a post-selection of the correlations found in a Bell scenario: the post-selection

procedure consists on keeping the events where  $y = a$  [38]. This inspires the following definition:

**Definition 6. General instrumental assemblages.**—An assemblage  $\{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$  is a general instrumental assemblage iff there exists a nonsignaling Bob-with-input assemblage  $\{\omega_{a|xy}\} \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{BWI}}$  such that  $\sigma_{a|x} = \omega_{a|x,y=a}$  for all  $a$  and  $x$ . We denote the set of such general assemblages by  $\mathcal{G}_I$ .

This definition allows us to adopt the viewpoint of Refs. [38,39], and hence understand the assemblages in the instrumental steering scenario as being a post-selection of those in a Bob-with-input scenario.

Note that this connection between the Bob-with-input scenario and the instrumental steering scenario allows us to interpret the latter beyond the traditional way that the instrumental setup is presented. Usually, the instrumental setup is such that there is signaling from Alice to Bob, since he needs to learn her outcome in order to implement the operation on his system. However, the particular perspective brought in by Ref. [38], and which we adopt here, highlights that, ultimately, this communication plays no distinct role in how resourceful the assemblages are, since the Bob-with-input scenario does not allow for signaling and can simulate them.

Returning to our central question, we now show that there is postquantum steering in the instrumental steering scenario. Moreover, we show that this does not follow from postquantum instrumental black-box correlations, and it is hence another independent form of post-quantumness.

**Theorem 7.**—The set of general instrumental assemblages strictly contains the set of quantum instrumental assemblages,  $\mathcal{Q}_I \not\subseteq \mathcal{G}_I$ . Hence, postquantum instrumental steering exists.

**Theorem 8.**—Postquantum steering in the instrumental steering scenario is independent of postquantum instrumental correlations. Namely, there exist general assemblages  $\{\sigma_{a|x}\}$  that are not quantum realizable, but which can only lead to quantum correlations  $p(a,b|x)$  in the instrumental scenario.

These two theorems are proven together in the Supplemental Material, but their proof is very similar to that of Theorem 4. The general assemblage that is used here as an example is that which derives from (6) by setting  $y = a$ , which is both provably postquantum in the instrumental scenario, and can only lead to quantum instrumental black-box correlations.

Thus, postquantum steering is also possible within the instrumental scenario, and this is independent of the existence of correlations with no quantum explanation in the fully device-independent instrumental scenario. Hence, postquantum instrumental steering is another genuinely new effect. Finally, in terms of number of variables (inputs and outputs), the instrumental scenario is the simplest one where postquantum steering can exist.

**Discussion.**—Exploring plausible effects beyond quantum theory that are nevertheless consistent with relativistic

causality [35], is important from various perspectives: on the one hand, it allows possible extensions of quantum theory to be explored, in the light of quantum gravity [40]. On the other, it allows us to develop a deeper understanding of quantum theory itself, by identifying those properties of it that are truly quantum [41–44]. Here, we have shown that for the important form of nonlocality known as steering, it is possible in principle to go beyond what quantum theory allows even when considering only two parties, if suitable generalizations of the traditional scenario are considered. Crucially, we showed that our examples of postquantum steering are genuinely new, and are not related to other postquantum nonlocal effects. We further developed a numerical technique to bound the maximum quantum violation of a steering inequality—a promising tool for developing future applications of this new type of steering.

In addition, on the way, we also showed that postquantum steering is impossible in the sequential-measurement generalization of steering, schematically depicted in Fig. 1(b). As such, we have extended the GHJW no-go theorem [14,15] to this setting, with details provided in the Supplemental Material [21].

The “instrumental setup” [19,20] is known to be the one with the fewest number of variables able to admit a classical-quantum gap [45]. This is closely related to the setup of Fig. 1(d), except that Bob’s system is a classical variable. Previously, classical-quantum gaps had been found in Bell-type [38,39,46] and steering [37] scenarios. Furthermore, quantum-postquantum gaps have also been found in Bell-type scenarios [38,39]; but the existence of postquantum instrumental steering remained an open question. The discovery of the latter here thus also resolves this open question.

Going forward, the most interesting question now is to understand the power of postquantum steering. For instance, are there information-theoretic or physical principles that are violated by the newly discovered forms of postquantum steering found here? In addition, it would be interesting to explore information processing tasks exploiting postquantum steering as a resource. For example, one task where traditional steering is a resource is subchannel discrimination [47]. It would be interesting to study whether postquantum steering gives an advantage in tasks related to this. More generally, now that we have uncovered postquantum steering in a bipartite setting, it paves the way for analyzing a broad range of bipartite tasks from this new direction. Indeed, we note that our newly introduced Bob-with-input steering scenario has already been investigated within the context of resource theories [48]. We expect our newly developed numerical technique will become relevant for exploring the power of postquantum steering.

Our overarching hope is that studying quantum theory “from the outside,” whether from the perspective of steering, or other nonlocal and nonclassical effects, will lead to novel insights into the very structure of quantum theory and

the possibilities and limitations of quantum theory for information processing. We expect our results and new insights to contribute to this rapidly developing and exciting field.

We thank Rodrigo Gallego, Matt Pusey, John Selby, and Elie Wolfe for fruitful discussions. This research was supported by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science. A. B. S. acknowledges partial support by the Foundation for Polish Science (IRAP project, ICTQT, Contract No. 2018/MAB/5, cofinanced by EU within Smart Growth Operational Programme). M. J. H. and A. B. S. acknowledge the FQXi large grant “The Emergence of Agents from Causal Order.” L. A. acknowledges financial support from the Brazilian agencies CNPq (PQ Grant No. 311416/2015-2 and INCT-IQ), FAPERJ (JCN E-26/202.701/2018), CAPES (PROCAD2013), and the Serrapilheira Institute (Grant No. Serra-1709-17173). P. S. acknowledges support from a Royal Society URF (UHQT).

- 
- [1] E. Schrödinger, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **32**, 446 (1936).
  - [2] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 140402 (2007).
  - [3] C. Branciard, E. G. Cavalcanti, S. P. Walborn, V. Scarani, and H. M. Wiseman, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 010301(R) (2012).
  - [4] Y. Z. Law, L. P. Thinh, J.-D. Bancal, and V. Scarani, *J. Phys. A* **47**, 424028 (2014).
  - [5] E. Passaro, D. Cavalcanti, P. Skrzypczyk, and A. Acín, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 113010 (2015).
  - [6] M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, and N. Brunner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160402 (2014).
  - [7] R. Uola, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160403 (2014).
  - [8] D. Cavalcanti and P. Skrzypczyk, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 052112 (2016).
  - [9] I. Supic and M. J. Hoban, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 075006 (2016).
  - [10] A. Gheorghiu, P. Wallden, and E. Kashefi, *New J. Phys.* **19**, 023043 (2017).
  - [11] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
  - [12] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, *J. Math. Mech.* **17**, 59 (1968).
  - [13] S. Popescu, *Nat. Phys.* **10**, 264 (2014).
  - [14] N. Gisin, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **62**, 363 (1989).
  - [15] L. P. Hughston, R. Jozsa, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Lett. A* **183**, 14 (1993).
  - [16] A. B. Sainz, N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, P. Skrzypczyk, and T. Vértesi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 190403 (2015).
  - [17] M. J. Hoban and A. B. Sainz, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 053048 (2018).
  - [18] A. B. Sainz, L. Aolita, M. Piani, M. J. Hoban, and P. Skrzypczyk, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 083040 (2018).

- [19] P. Spirtes, N. Glymour, and R. Scheines, *Causation, Prediction, and Search*, 2nd ed. (MIT Press, Cambridge, 2001), ISBN 0-262-19440-6.
- [20] J. Pearl, *Causality* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2009), ISBN 9780511803161.
- [21] See Supplemental Material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050404> for proofs of various theorems from the main text, and a method to bound the quantum value of steering inequalities, which includes Refs [22–34].
- [22] Note that the second measurement  $\{M_{a_2|x_2}\}_{a_2}$  will in general implicitly depend upon both  $a_1$  and  $x_1$  of the prior measurement—we can assume without loss of generality that the post-measurement state after the first measurement contains within it all the classical information about the choice of measurement and the outcome, such that the second measurement implicitly conditions upon this classical information. This means we do not need to explicitly write the dependence upon  $a_1$  and  $x_1$  in  $M_{a_2|x_2}$ .
- [23] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022339 (2009).
- [24] M. J. Hoban and A. B. Sainz (to be published).
- [25] D. Cavalcanti and P. Skrzypczyk, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **80**, 024001 (2017).
- [26] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 010401 (2007).
- [27] D. Cavalcanti, P. Skrzypczyk, G. H. Aguilar, R. V. Nery, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, and S. P. Walborn, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7941 (2015).
- [28] MATLAB Release 2018a, The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United States.
- [29] M. Grant and S. Boyd, <http://cvxr.com/cvx> (2013).
- [30] M. Grant and S. Boyd, in *Recent Advances in Learning and Control*, edited by V. Blondel, S. Boyd, and H. Kimura, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences (Springer-Verlag, London, 2008), pp. 95–110 (a tribute to M. Vidyasagar), ISBN 0170-8643.
- [31] K. C. Toh, M. J. Todd, and R. H. Tütüncü, *Optim. Methods Software* **11**, 545 (1999).
- [32] V. Paulsen, *Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002).
- [33] W. F. Stinespring, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **6**, 211 (1955).
- [34] B. Coecke and A. Kissinger, *Picturing Quantum Processes: A First Course in Quantum Theory and Diagrammatic Reasoning* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2017).
- [35] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379 (1994).
- [36] Note that the fact that the assemblage can be represented as arising through the application of a positive but not completely positive map is a useful mathematical fact, which simultaneously provides a route to show that it is postquantum (since it involves a map which is not allowed in quantum theory), and that it cannot lead to postquantum nonlocality, due to Ref. [18]. This representation does not dictate that the assemblage has to arise in a such a way; how it would be physically prepared will depend upon details of the postquantum theory. Our particular way to express the assemblage here is merely one mathematical representation that is useful for our purposes.
- [37] R. V. Nery, M. M. Taddei, R. Chaves, and L. Aolita, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 140408 (2018).
- [38] T. Van Himbeeck, J. Bohr Brask, S. Pironio, R. Ramanathan, A. B. Sainz, and E. Wolfe, *Quantum* **3**, 186 (2019).
- [39] R. Chaves, G. Carvacho, I. Agresti, V. Di Giulio, L. Aolita, S. Giacomini, and F. Sciarrino, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 291 (2018).
- [40] L. Hardy, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 3081 (2007).
- [41] L. Masanes and M. P. Müller, *New J. Phys.* **13**, 063001 (2011).
- [42] L. Hardy, [arXiv:quant-ph/0101012](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0101012).
- [43] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 012311 (2011).
- [44] J. H. Selby, C. M. Scandolo, and B. Coecke, [arXiv:1802.00367](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.00367).
- [45] J. Henson, R. Lal, and M. F. Pusey, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 113043 (2014).
- [46] I. Agresti *et al.*, [arXiv:1905.02027](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.02027).
- [47] M. Piani and J. Watrous, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 060404 (2015).
- [48] D. Schmid, D. Rosset, and F. Buscemi, *Quantum* **4**, 262 (2020).